REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action claims 1-7, 12-21, 23-28, and 31-57 were pending and rejected. In this response, claims 27-28 have been canceled. Claims 1-7, 12, 14, 21, 26, 31, 38, 40, and 47 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 21, 26, 31, and 47-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections have been overcome.

Claims 1, 7, 12-15, 19, 21, 25, 31, 37, and 47-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,021,429 of Danknick ("Danknick"). In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 7, 12-15, 19, 21, 25, 31, 37, and 47-57 include limitations that are not disclosed by Danknick.

Specifically, for example, independent claim 1 recites as follows:

> 1. A method for providing dynamic configuration services comprising:
> requesting, with a local device, configuration services from a first remote device over a network in response to connecting the local device to the network, the requested configuration services <u>including acquiring an IP (Internet protocol) address and a domain name for the local device from the first remote device, wherein the first remote device operates as a DHCP (dynamic host configuration protocol) server to the network</u>;
> operating the local device as a configuration services server to provide configuration services to one or more second remote devices of said network if the response to the requested configuration services is not received by the local device from said first remote device within a predetermined period of time or if the response to the requested configuration services is received by the local device from said first remote device within the predetermined period of time and the response indicates that the local device has a higher priority than the first remote device, <u>wherein the local device is operated as a DHCP server to the network to provide the configuration service, the configuration services</u>

provided by the local device including assigning an IP address and allocating a domain name for each of the second remote devices; and

operating the local device as a configuration services client to receive configuration services from said first remote device if the response is received within the predetermined period of time and said first remote device has a higher priority than said local device, wherein the local device is configured to use the received configuration services from the first remote device when entering the network, including acquiring an IP address and a domain name for the local device from the first remote device, wherein the local device utilizes the acquired IP address and domain name to boot the local device up and enter the network using the acquired IP address and domain name as an identity representing the local device in the network.

(Emphasis added)

Independent claim 1 includes a local device that operates as a configuration services server to provide configuration services (e.g., allocating and assigning IP addresses and domain names) to other remote devices within the network, if a request for configuration services from a remote device is not received within a predetermined period of time, or alternatively, if the response of the request indicates that the local device has a higher priority than the remote device. Otherwise, the local device operates as a client to the remote device to receive configuration services from the remote device (e.g., acquiring IP address and domain name), where the local device is configured using the received configuration services in order to enter the network (e.g., using the acquired IP address and domain name to represent the local device). It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from Danknick.

Although Danknick discloses a list manager to provide a list of device addresses for the LAN and to operate as a slave which provides a device address of the network device to a list manager, such a list manager can merely provide address list to other nodes of the network. However, the list manager cannot provide configuration services to the network, such as, for example, allocating and assigning IP addresses and domain names to clients of the network (see

Danknick, Abstract; col. 2, lines 24 to 41). There is no disclosure within Danknick that a network device can either operate as a server to provide configuration services or as a client to receive configuration services from another device and to use the received configuration services to boot itself up into the network.

The list manage of Danknick as a slave device becomes active only if the master device is down and the list manager never takes over the operations of the master when the master is still operating.

In contrast, the local device of the present invention as claimed takes over the configuration server task from an existing server device if the priority of the local device is higher than the existing server device, even if the existing server device is still available.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Danknick. Similarly, independent claims 12, 21, 26, and 31 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted claims 12, 21, 26, and 31 are not anticipated by Danknick. Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are not anticipated by Danknick.

Further, the local device of present invention as claimed utilizes a variety of operating states to determine whether the local device should be operating as a server device or a client device, as recited in newly added claims 47-57. It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references discloses or suggests such limitations.

The office action contended that sections of Figs. 5A-5B; Abstract; col. 9, lines 7-40; col. 10, line 46 to col. 11, line 29; col. 11, line 36 to col. 12, line 38; and col. 15, lines 5-26 of Danknick read on claims 47-57 (see 5/4/2005 Office Action, pages 10-13). Applicant

respectfully disagrees. Claims 47-57 are related to certain operating states of a device in order to determine whether the respective device would become a master configuration services server to provide configuration services to members of the network. These limitations, such as, for example, the initial state, non-master state, temporary master state, and the master state, are absent from Danknick.

Although Danknick discloses a slave list manager becomes an active list manager, however, the approaches of Danknick and the present invention as claimed are significantly different. In fact, there is no mention of the specific states and how they are utilized in Danknick.

In order to anticipate a claim, each and every limitations of the claim must be taught by the cited reference. It is respectfully submitted that the above discussed limitations are absent from Danknick.

Claims 2-6, 16-18, 23-26, 32-36, 38-41, and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danknick in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,446 of Lister ("Lister). Claims 27-28 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danknick in view of Lister and U.S. Patent No. 6,618,806 of Brown et al. ("Brown"). Claims 20 and 46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danknick in view of Lister and U.S. Patent No. 6,446,108 of Rosenberg et al. ("Rosenberg").

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7, 12-21, 23-26, and 31-57 include limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, individually or in combination.

Lister relates to a proxy file cache for providing names for a file server. The proxy file cache stores a portion of the file or files of the file server and responds to a request to access the

file server (Lister, Summary, col. 3, line 39 to col. 4, line 67). That is, the proxy file cache serves as a cache for the file server. The proxy file cache in Lister serves as a cache for the file server. There is no mention in Lister that a local device becomes a configuration server when a response to a request for configuration services is not received from a configuration server within a predetermined period of time, or alternatively, if the priority of the local device is higher than the configuration server.

It is respectfully submitted that the proxy file cache of Lister does not read on the local device that becomes a server as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Rather, the proxy file cache serves only the cache or the proxy for the file server. The proxy file cache of Lister does not take over the file server as a file server. One with reasonable skill in the art would only consider the proxy file cache as an extension of the file server, just like the cache memory of a memory drive. There is no mention or suggestion in Lister that the proxy file cache becomes a server (e.g., file server) when a response to a request to the file server is not received within a predetermined period of time, or when the priority of the proxy file cache is higher than the file server. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are also absent from Brown and Rangaraian.

Furthermore, there is no suggestion within the cited references to combine Lister, Danknick, and Rangaraian. Lister relates to name services for the file server, while Danknick relates to address services and Rangaraian relates to network monitoring or trapping. They solve significantly different problems and their approaches are significantly different. For example, Lister does not need the address services of Danknick and the network trapping services of Rangaraian. The proxy file cache of Lister only provides a portion of files to the client without having to access the file server again, which typically takes longer time. There is no address

service involved and obviously no network traffic trapping needed because all traffic to the file server has to go through the proxy (e.g., the proxy file cache). Thus, there is no motivation to combine these references. One with ordinary skill in the art would not combine these references because such a combination lacks reasonable expectation of success, since they are solving significantly different problems and their approaches are significantly different.

Even if they were combined, it is respectfully submitted that such a combination still lacks the limitations set forth above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that 1-7, 12-21, 23-26, and 31-57 are patentable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: September 2, 2005

Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300